UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,650	02/13/2002	Victor Tang	051373-0117 (22)	7146

26371	7590	04/22/2005

FOLEY & LARDNER
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 3800
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308

EXAMINER
BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 February 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> ((e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 6-8, 14-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0032254 to Hawkins.

a.   As per claims 1 and 14, Hawkins teaches a method and apparatus for Internet access.

Furthermore, Hawkins teaches a method of communicating between a client and a server, the

method comprising: if communication is from the client to the server, receiving compressed data

at a proxy; decompressing the received compressed data; and communicating the uncompressed

data to a specified server (See page 5, paragraph [0085], the proxy serve r decompresses

information from the wireless network side for use on the Internet side of the proxy server); if

communication is from the server to the client, receiving uncompressed data at the proxy;

compressing the received uncompressed data; and communicating the compressed data to the

client (See page 5, paragraph [0085], the proxy server converts internet protocols and content

into a form that can be used by the wireless network and the wireless communication device).

b.   As per claims 6 and 15, Hawkins teaches wherein the client is a wireless device (See

page 5, paragraph [0085]).

c.   As per claim 7, Hawkins teaches wherein the wireless device is a cell phone (See page 1,

paragraph [0008]).

d.   As per claims 8 and 16, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, Hawkins teaches wherein the proxy removes any proxy-specific information from

headers in the compressed data (See page 46, paragraph [0520]).

e.   As per claim 20, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, Hawkins teaches wherein the server services both non-compressed and compressed

requests (See 6, paragraph [0093]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application No. 2001/0032254 to Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent Application No.

2002/0091738 to Rohr Baugh et al.

a.   As per claim 2, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein the data is an extensible markup language (XML)

document.

        Rohrabaugh et al teaches a resolution independent vector display of internet content.

Furthermore, Rohrabaugh et al teaches wherein the data is an extensible markup language

(XML) (See page 5, paragraph [0058])

        It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the data is an extensible markup language (XML) as taught by

Rohrabaugh et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to support resolution

independent vector display of Internet content (See page 1, paragraph [0009]).

b.   As per claim 3, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above. However,

Hawkins fails to teach examining headers of the XML document.

        Rohrabaugh et al teaches examining headers of the XML document (See page 9,

paragraph [0079]).

        It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate examining headers of the XML document as taught by Rohrabaugh et al

in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to separate the content into object based on logical

groupings of content portion (See page 9, paragraph [0079]).

5.   Claims 4-5, 9, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent Application No. 2001/0032254 to Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent Application No.

2005/0004875 to Kontio et al.

a.   As per claim 4, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above. However,

Hawkins fails to teach wherein the proxy dynamically generates code space of uncompressed

server responses.

Kontio et al teaches wherein the proxy dynamically generates code space of

uncompressed server responses (See page 23, paragraph [0196])

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the proxy dynamically generated code space of uncompressed

server responses as taught by Kontio et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to reduce

the transmission size of XML documents and allow more effective use of XML data on

narrowband communication channels (See page 23, paragraph [0196]).

b.   As per claim 5, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above. However,

Hawkins fails to teach wherein the proxy obtains code space of a request from the client.

Kontio teaches wherein the proxy obtains code space of a request from the client (See

page 23, paragraph 0196]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the intention

was made to incorporate the proxy obtains code space of a request from the client as taught by

Kontio in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to reduce the transmission size of XML

documents and allow more effective use of XML data on narrowband communication channels

(See page 23, paragraph [0196]).

c.   As per claims 9 and 17, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above.

However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein the proxy dynamically generates new code space if

code space does not exist to compress communication from the server to the client.

Kontio teaches wherein the proxy dynamically generates new code space if code space

does not exist to compress communication from the server to the client (See page 23, paragraph

[0196]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the proxy dynamically generates new code space if code space

does not exist to compress communication from the server to the client in order to reduce the

transmission size of XML documents and allow more effective use of XML data on narrowband

communication channels (See page 23, paragraph [0196]).

d.   As per claim 18, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, Hawkins fails to teach wherein the compressed request from the client includes

headers having an address of an intended server. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein the

request includes a code space.

Kontio teaches wherein the request includes a code space (See page 23, paragraph

[0196]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the request includes a code space as taught by Kontio in the

claimed invention of Hawkins in order to reduce the transmission size of XML documents and

allow more effective use of XML data on narrowband communication channels (See page 23,

paragraph [0196]).

6.   Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application No. 2001/0032254 to Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent Application No.2003/0023628

to Girardot et al.

a.   As per claim 10, Hawkins teaches a compression proxy process comprising: receiving a

compressed request from a client, the compressed request including an XML document; when

the proxy has the correct code space, decompressing the XML document; communicating the

decompressed XML document to a specified server; communicating a server response from the

specified server; if code space is not available to compress the reply, dynamically generating a

new code space; if code space is available to compress the reply or after the new code space is

generated, compressing the reply; and communicating the compressed reply including a code

space version or identification header to the client. However, Hawkins fails to teach determining

if code space corresponding to the XML document is available and determining if code space is

available to compress the reply, if code space is not available to compress the reply, dynamically

generating a new code space.

Girardot et al teaches an efficient RPC mechanism using XML. Furthermore, Girardot

teaches determining if code space corresponding to the XML document is available and

determining if code space is available to compress the reply, if code space is not available to

compress the reply, dynamically generating a new code space (See page 8, paragraph [0109]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate determining if code space corresponding to the XML document is

available and determining if code space is available to compress the reply, if code space is not

available to compress the reply, dynamically generating a new code space as taught by Girardot

et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to compress character data and defines a

strategy to build code space that allow for XML-RPC to be performed with a reduction in

bandwidth utilization (See page 2, paragraph [0011]).

b.   As per claim 11, Hawkins in view of Girardot teaches the claimed invention as described

above. Furthermore, Hawkins fails to teach wherein the XML document includes headers, the

headers including information on an intended server uniform resource locator (URL) (See page

39, paragraph [0405]).

c.   As per claim 12, Hawkins in view of Girardot teaches the claimed invention as described

above. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein if the code space is not available, the server

responds to the client with a request for the code space and the client replies with the requested data.

Girardot teaches wherein if the code space is not available, the server responds to the client with a request for the code space and the client replies with the requested data (See page 8, paragraph [0109]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein if the code space is not available, the server responds to the client with a request for the code space and the client replies with the requested data as taught by Girardot in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to compress character data and defines a strategy to build code space that allow for XML-RPC to be performed with a reduction in bandwidth utilization (See page 2, paragraph [0011]).

d.   As per claim 13, Hawkins in view of Girardot teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hawkins teaches stripping proxy-specific header information from the XML document received from the client (See page 46, paragraph [0520]).

7.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0032254 to Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0156872 to Brown.

19.   As per claim 19, Hawkins teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein the server is a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) server.

Brown teaches a SOAP server (See page 9, paragraph [0265]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the server is a SOAP server as taught by Brown in the claimed invention of Hawkins in order to process HTML/XML Soap data packets (See page 9, paragraph [0265]).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,956490 to Buchholz et al teaches a method, client device, server and computer readable medium for specifying and negotiating compression of uniform resource identifier.

U.S. Patent No. 6,247048 to Greer et al teaches a method and apparatus for transcoding characters sets between Internet host and thin client devices over data networks.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER